

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-2478**

---

DONNA M. BRIGGS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF NORFOLK, a municipal corporation,  
organized under the laws of the Commonwealth  
of Virginia; PAUL D. FRAIM, individually and  
officially in his capacity as Mayor of  
Norfolk; KAMALA HALLGREN LANNETTI, individual-  
ly and officially as the Former Assistant  
Attorney for the City of Norfolk; HAROLD P.  
JUREN, individually and officially as the As-  
sistant City Attorney for the City of Norfolk;  
MELVIN HIGH, individually and officially as  
the Chief of Police for the City of Norfolk;  
JAMES BROWNLIE, individually and officially as  
a Lieutenant on the Norfolk Police Force;  
ALLEN BOSTJANCIC, individually and officially  
as a Police Officer for the City of Norfolk;  
MARK RAILLING, individually and officially as  
a Police Officer for the City of Norfolk;  
LEONARD MERRITT, individually,

Defendants - Appellees,

CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH,

Movant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge. (CA-98-288-2)

---

Submitted: May 25, 1999

Decided: June 24, 1999

---

Before WILKINS and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and HALL, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donna M. Briggs, Appellant Pro Se. Alan Brody Rashkind, Krista Ann Griffith, FURNISS, DAVIS, RASHKIND & SAUNDERS, Norfolk, Virginia; Leonard Merritt, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order that dismissed some, but not all, parties and claims in her civil action. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the order is not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.

We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED